

## **NORTHGATE STAKEHOLDERS GROUP DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

**North Seattle Community College  
ED 2843A in the Dr. Peter Ku Education Building  
Thursday, May 20, 2004, 4:00 pm – 7:30 pm**

---

The Northgate Stakeholders Group (Group) held its fourth meeting at North Seattle Community College on Thursday, May 20, 2004 from 4:00 pm to 7:30 pm. The purposes of the meeting were to:

- Review and approve meeting summary #3 and hear the results of the May 13 Community Forum;
- Respond to a request for input on inclusion of NACP goals and policies into the City's Comprehensive Plan;
- Review a revised workplan and schedule for advice to the City;
- Continue discussions concerning South Lot open space and natural drainage options; construction coordination between SPU and Lorig; and transportation issues.

### **Welcome/Agenda Review/Updates**

#### ***Welcome, Chair Ron LaFayette***

Ron LaFayette welcomed Stakeholders Group members to their fourth meeting. He thanked Group member Ron Posthuma of King County Metro for providing food for the meeting.

#### ***Agenda Review, Alice Shorett***

Alice Shorett, facilitator, briefly reviewed the agenda for the meeting. She noted in particular, that there would be time to discuss a revised workplan and schedule for advice.

#### ***Meeting Summary***

The Chair asked the Group if there were comments on the draft summary from the May 11 Stakeholders Group meeting. The Group approved the summary with the following changes:

- Between King County's presentation on Transit-Oriented Development and the Coordinated Transportation Investment Plan (CTIP) discussion, a member reported that he had made a point of order that was not reflected in the minutes. He wanted it noted that the Lorig South Lot Development, which he saw as one of two topics being fast-tracked and rushed to an early decision, had not been discussed or deliberated at any meeting despite being listed on the Group's workplan for discussion on April 20 and May 11. He noted that it had not been mentioned at any

meeting except for a brief presentation at the Group's introductory meeting, for which stakeholders were provided no information in advance. Moreover, the deadline for advice from the Group was continually moved forward, first from late June, to June 3, and then to May 20. He wanted it noted that the Group had had no discussion or deliberation of the Lorig South Lot Development even though the schedule indicated it would be discussed at three meetings before the Group offered advice to the City on the Lorig South Lot Development. The Chair had noted the member's comment. A member of the facilitation team had indicated that a revised workplan and schedule would be brought to the May 20 meeting.

- It was clarified that the Northgate Area Plan should be incorporated into the scope of work for CTIP rather than being considered a "handout" to accompany CTIP.
- On Page 6, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, it was noted that the Park & Ride (P&R) lot referenced is located at 112<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Ave.
- In the discussion concerning the hybrid drainage option (page 3, second bullet), the summary was revised to read as follows: the hybrid should meet safety and security concerns because of the eyes from the street, from the sidewalk and from residential development.
- On page 4, the first bullet was revised to read: In response to a question about the difference in comparing results per acre v. per year, it was explained that one shows which option is the most efficient while the other shows which one removes the most pollutants in aggregate. The natural drainage is more efficient at removing sediment and pollutants, but the hybrid removes more in total because of its larger drainage area.
- The straw poll final count was clarified as follows: Hybrid, 17; Natural drainage 2; Daylighting, 1; and one abstention.

## **May 13<sup>th</sup> Community Forum Report**

The Chair thanked all of the Stakeholder panelists and members who attended the May 13<sup>th</sup> Community Forum. He noted that Mark Troxel had done an excellent job with publicity and organization of the event and that there had been a great turn out. Another member noted that the Forum was worthwhile since everyone that came seemed to be really interested and paying attention.

Comments and suggestions for future community forums included:

- It was rushed. Group members on panels needed more time to prepare.
- It would be better to separate informational presentations from Stakeholders Group views. For example, the City and Lorig (or the appropriate person) could provide information and the stakeholders could present the Group's point/s of view.
- There was concern that there had not been a lot of give and take.
- It was suggested that information could be presented in a packet with detail that the public could read and take home or a mailing could be sent in advance so people would be better informed when they came to the meeting.

- There was a sense that the panelists did not necessarily represent all points of view. It was suggested that future meetings should have more time for comment and discussion, perhaps by having fewer topics to cover and more time for interaction.
- It was suggested that Shoreline should be included in outreach for future meetings.
- It was also proposed that the handout prepared by Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund for the Community Forum should be posted at DPD's Northgate web page.
- It was suggested that the Group should send a letter to ratepayers before finalizing its advice and then have a discussion about the pros and cons of doing anything v. picking among the three options. (This item was discussed again during the review of Draft Advice #1.)

The Chair concluded the discussion by noting that staff would be tasked with developing ideas for how to get information to the public before future community forums. He again thanked the presenters for a job well done and noted the interest the public had shown in the issues.

### **City Council's Request for Input on NACP Inclusion into the City's Comprehensive Plan**

The Chair reminded the Group about a letter dated May 10, 2004 from Councilmember Peter Steinbrueck, requesting its input on the inclusion of the Northgate Area Comprehensive Plan (NACP) goals and policies into the City's Comprehensive Plan. The Chair introduced Norm Schwab, Lead for the City Council Central Staff team. He explained that the role of the Central Staff was to serve all nine councilmembers, not individual members, and that they were the City Council's counterparts to the Mayor's staff. He further explained that their role was to provide independent analysis of the Mayor's recommendations, draft legislation, and help councilmembers make decisions in the most knowledgeable way possible. He introduced other members of his team, some of whom had observed previous Stakeholders Group meetings: Rebecca Herzfeld, Virginia Beas-Garcia, and Geri Beardsley.

Ms. Herzfeld explained that inclusion of NACP goals and policies into the City's Comprehensive Plan was initiated by the City Council because the Council recognized that this was important to the community. Ms. Herzfeld indicated that it was up to the Group to decide whether or not to take on this additional task. She explained that the intent of this inclusion was not to change the goals or policies in the NACP but rather 1) to make the NACP similar to the 37 other adopted neighborhood plans in the City and 2) to make it comply with the Growth Management Act, which requires public involvement. The Council's hope, she said, was that the Group would take the time to provide public review. She indicated that the deadline for input was the end of July because the City Council was scheduled to take up the issue in August.

In the ensuing discussion, members pointed out that the NACP was the context and foundation for much of what the Group had been asked to do and that the community was eager to have the NACP – Seattle's first neighborhood plan – incorporated into the City's Comprehensive Plan. After discussion the Group requested a briefing at the June 3

meeting that would focus on what would change as a result of inclusion into the City's Comprehensive Plan so the Group could provide more informed input.

## **Revised Workplan and Schedule**

In response to concern expressed at the last Stakeholder meeting, Alice Shorett, the facilitator, noted that the Group's workplan had been revised to ensure that the Group had adequate time for discussion and did not feel rushed in developing its advice to the City. She highlighted the following changes:

- Meeting dates were added on Thursday, June 24<sup>th</sup> and Thursday, July 22<sup>nd</sup>.
- September/October meetings were added to the schedule, with final dates to be determined.
- Finalizing the Group's advice to the City on South Lot open space and drainage options was scheduled for June 3. Advice on CTIP, on a coordinated site agreement, on open space and pedestrian connections, and on inclusion of NACP goals and policies into the Seattle Comprehensive Plan was scheduled for June 24. Advice on the Lorig development was scheduled for October (date to be determined) because the architects had just been hired.
- It was noted that a presentation by Simon Properties could be expected at the July or September meetings.

A request was made for some of the future Group meetings to be held on Tuesdays instead of Thursdays. It was noted that this change would depend on the availability of staff and the meeting room.

## **Northgate South Lot Open Space and Natural Drainage**

### ***Draft Advice, David Harrison***

David Harrison of the facilitation team described the process for drafting the first Group's first advice concerning the Northgate South Lot Open Space and Natural Drainage options. He explained that he had drafted the initial language and incorporated suggestions from two Stakeholders Group members who had volunteered to review and edit the first draft. He noted that another Group member had sent feedback via e-mail to him and to the members of the Group.

The Group discussed clarifications and wording changes to all sections of the draft. In the discussions, it was agreed that the group should have an articulate discussion about cost. In terms of the draft advice, it was suggested there be a description in the advice referencing the cost figures that SPU had presented and the Group's understanding of the dollar range and the parameters around the cost. Relative to the context for the Stakeholders Group's consideration of three drainage options, it was suggested there be narrative referencing the Northgate Framework Resolution. It was agreed that since the Group had until June 3 to finalize its advice, it would take the extra time for full discussion. It was agreed that David would revise the draft advice and send it for an

additional round of discussion. The revised draft would address safety, cost, and the “no action” alternative.

It was acknowledged that the issue of drainage had been a stumbling block to the revitalization of Northgate in the past and fear was expressed that nothing would happen at Northgate if nothing happened about the drainage issue. A member indicated that he felt the Group was being asked to give an opinion and advice on a concept, not to let a contract.

### ***SPU Drainage Recommendation, Nancy Ahern***

The Chair introduced Nancy Ahern, Deputy Director of Seattle Public Utilities (SPU), to update the Group on the recommendation that SPU will make to the Mayor. She thanked the Group, Miranda Maupin and the Technical Team for their thoughtfulness and willingness to go through the process. She also noted that the Group’s preceding discussion on this issue mirrored those that SPU had had internally. She commented that a lot of useful information had been developed over the course of the joint process, which has enabled SPU to have robust internal discussions. It had given SPU the opportunity to try out its triple bottom line analysis in asset management: financial, social, and environmental impacts of projects. After careful consideration of water quality, cost-effectiveness, and community values, she reported that SPU would recommend the hybrid option to the Mayor, provided an agreement were reached with Lorig. Ms. Ahern pointed to a handout in members’ packets that outlined the details that would need to occur in order to finalize their recommendations. This included reaching agreement with Lorig on site reconfiguration, which was essential for either the hybrid or the natural drainage option. In addition, necessary steps included:

1. Lorig purchase of land from Simon Properties
2. Budget authority to SPU for project funding
3. Agreement with Lorig on a site coordination and construction plan

She explained that SPU would provide more information on the construction agreement at the Group’s June 3 meeting and the Department would forward its proposal to the City Council on June 8. She encouraged the Group to continue to offer ideas or considerations throughout the process.

A member raised a point that the project involved a lot of public dollars; he indicated his belief that the agreement with Lorig should include requirements for apprenticeships and prevailing wages. A member asked if the City could avoid rules and regulations by the size of the lot and another member asked if Lorig were asking for waivers of state and municipal code rules. Ms. Ahern indicated that the City would follow all applicable state and municipal rules.

### ***Lorig Development Timeline***

Following a short break, Steve Bollinger of Lorig repeated that Lorig would present to the Group on July 22. He said that the program had changed dramatically and the current plan

was to have less retail and more housing. He indicated that the development would go through two public processes: Design Review and the Stakeholders Group process. He indicated that the project's delay would benefit both processes. He said that Lorig had requested an early design guidelines meeting that very day.

Following a discussion of pedestrian workshop results (below), a member wanted it noted that the Lorig Development was expected to have been a 20-minute agenda item and that it had not happened.

## **Pedestrian Connections Workshop Results**

Marty Curry, Executive Director of the Planning Commission, presented the results of the Pedestrian Connection workshop. She referred the Group to the summary handout and map that was provided. She also noted that a group of UW architecture students had developed 15 different proposals, including very practical and interesting suggestions, for improving pedestrian connections and offered to make them available to any members of the Group who were interested.

Ms. Curry introduced Planning Commissioner Mimi Sheridan who presented the main themes from the Pedestrian Connections Workshop, including:

- There are a number of major destinations (Northwest hospital, Northgate mall, the post office, the Community College)
- People *do* walk to Northgate and have ideas about where they would like to walk and how access and safety could be better addressed.
- There are significant barriers to a pedestrian-oriented environment: the size of the mall, I-5, and the priority given to traffic over pedestrians.

At the same time, Ms. Sheridan said, new development creates opportunities for improvement. She cautioned that the City and the community would have to make a concerted effort to realize the improvements as development occurred. She recommended that:

- The City and SDOT should make pedestrians as high a priority as vehicles.
- The Open Space/Pedestrian Plan must provide a strong framework for investment so development was not haphazard.
- The City should set a goal of working with Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Metro/King County, and North Seattle Community College to make crossing I-5 a clear priority so that issue would be on the table when the State took action.

In terms of next steps, she indicated that the Planning Commission was developing and refining recommendations and would get them to the City Council in June. She indicated that the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) and consultants would continue working on this set of issues.

In response to a question about the inclusion of bicycle connections, Ms. Curry affirmed that such connections were included in the workshop findings distributed to the Group. A concern was expressed that the map did not show the potential use by bicycles or pedestrians on the South Lot open space. A question was raised if any consideration had been given to street design, streetscape and how welcoming to pedestrians the design would be. Ms. Curry indicated that the Northgate Overlay included guidelines that addressed some of these issues. The Commission also had survey data on what people wanted to see that would be incorporated into the Planning Commission's recommendations. She invited interested people to visit the Planning Commission's website. She also invited interested Group members to talk to her after the meeting and to meet with her separately to review the findings and student-generated concepts and graphics in greater detail.

A member indicated that the CTIP map with "flags," developed on the basis of public input at the May 13 Community Forum, was very good and expressed her hope that the Group would address solutions to the "flagged" problems.

### **Coordinated Transportation Investment Plan (CTIP)**

The Chair then introduced Julie Mercer Matlick of Seattle Department of Transportation. She indicated that the Group's packet included a proposed scope of work for CTIP and said that SDOT hoped to get the Group's input on that scope. Tony Mazella, also of SDOT, pointed to a map with a list of suggestions that people had made at the Community Forum. He indicated that the input from the Forum had been very valuable and linked well with other public input.

Barbara Maxwell reported that she, Shawn Olesen and Ron Posthuma (who had been panelists on CTIP at the Community Forum) had been asked by the facilitation team to begin the discussion. She said she would give a brief orientation to the NACP policies so that the entire Group would be starting from the same level of information. She felt it was also appropriate because the NACP was developed in the context of a traffic study, in response to projected growth. The constraints of I-5 and Northgate Way being at capacity were factors then as now. Referring to a question raised at the May 11 meeting about the number of parking spaces, she indicated that NACP put limits on the number of parking spaces at the Park & Ride (P&R). The intent was not to have drivers from further north use the Northgate P&R; transit was supposed to accommodate their needs. The expectation was that local residents would walk. Transportation demand management (TDM) was expected to reduce the number of vehicles. The P&R lot was intended for short-term parking and shopping. She said the need to focus on pedestrians more remained. She noted that the Northgate Framework Resolution highlighted pedestrian connections and said that plazas could make those connections for seniors, apartment renters, etc., and she encouraged the Group to become familiar with those policies. She said that Northgate had some very good visioning work to build on (the Pedestrian Connection Workshop and the UW architecture students work). She then introduced Ron Posthuma to describe some of the "knowns" and to look ahead to planned changes, both short- and long-term.

Mr. Posthuma pointed out several changes that had occurred in recent years. One was the City's requirement for a new street behind Target, which had benefited transportation in general. Further south, he pointed to 5<sup>th</sup> Ave. pedestrian improvements and reported that the City and County had reached agreement on the location for a bus stop near the new community center/library complex. He said King County was working with the City to line up money for the rest of the 5<sup>th</sup> Ave. improvements. He also noted that property at Northgate was very expensive, and King County and WSDOT had spent \$8 million to develop the existing P&R. He also noted that the Transportation Management Association was trying to encourage use of transit with strategies such as "buying down" the cost of transit passes. He said King County had earmarked money for this purpose. He also noted that a traffic signal and sidewalks were being added on 105<sup>th</sup>. Seattle had also done some sidewalk construction in other places. King County and the City were working on a grant for \$2 million to build Third Avenue and to make an east-west pedestrian connection across the P&R lot.

Tony Mazzella (SDOT) indicated that the City had a two-page list of transportation improvements that had occurred in recent years, including traffic calming projects and paving projects. However, he said, the City recognized that, when looking at the needs of Northgate, a much more robust set of improvements would be needed to accommodate the projected growth.

A member asked about the availability of money to fix broken sidewalks at 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave. North, by Target (which had caused senior citizens to fall and injure themselves) and crosswalks. Mr. Mazzella indicated that CTIP would look at pedestrian needs throughout the area, but he asked that they talk after the meeting if there were safety concerns that needed immediate attention.

Shawn Olesen expressed appreciation for the map that SDOT and the consultant team had developed, saying that it contained a great deal of information that was thought-provoking and raised possibilities that could transform the area. He asked when the Group would get more specific information on any of the projects and what the timeline was for the Group's input and recommendations.

Mr. Mazzella explained that the first step (Phase I) was to develop the consultant scope of work and that Phase II was expected to begin in July 2004 and go for nine to twelve months. Ms. Matlick indicated that an early task would be to look at plans and compile what had been done to date and to consider safety issues. She again said that SDOT wanted to hear the Group's priorities.

Mr. Mazzella indicated that SDOT would come back in late 2004 or early 2005 with a preliminary list of specific improvements – the "what" and "where" along with programs to reduce the number of people driving to and through Northgate. The next step would be to address funding. In response, a member indicated that \$2.33/gallon gasoline would get more people out of their cars and walking.



A member indicated that the City Council was in the process of discussing the site for the future Sound Transit station and wanted it to be sited at 103<sup>rd</sup> and First. He said he expected a decision on that location to be made in the coming four months.

In response to a question about whether or not an environmental impact statement (EIS) would be prepared in connection with CTIP (which she felt was needed to reconcile issues as a result of the repeal of the GDP), Mr. Mazzella indicated that SDOT had wondered what level of environmental review should be done for CTIP and thought an EIS would help identify mitigation.

Later in the meeting, a member responded that a Planned Action EIS would provide a holistic view of developments. It would help identify mitigation; it would also help to identify available capacity, so that all of the capacity was not used at the beginning, leaving nothing for a developer who came later.

Other questions and comments from the discussion included the following:

*Question:* What assumptions will be made for the models that will be used for forecasting? What criteria will you use? When will you do traffic counts? How do we have input into those selection criteria? How will you use new information in the modeling (example, high gas prices)?

*Response:* Ms. Matlick indicated that the City was developing a new model that would include pedestrians, bicycles and transit, not just cars. She further invited the Group to help SDOT decide on the appropriate mode split shares (transit, vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles). She cautioned that if Northgate Way were measured at 5 PM on a Friday, it could lead to a decision that more capacity was needed, which was not the direction the Mr. Mazzella added that the traffic counts provided information that covered a 24-hour period and SDOT could check data for any part of the day. He said SDOT would also look at employment and household growth projections.

Tom Noguchi (Mirai Associates) indicated that the model is intended to simulate behaviors and that gas prices, parking prices, congestion -- all could influence behaviors. He said that the data the team would use would be current (gathered within the last year or so).

*Question:* How far off of Northgate Way and 5<sup>th</sup> will the study look? Will it go as far south as 75<sup>th</sup> and as far east as Roosevelt? Will the study consider wellness goals as criteria?

*Question:* What projects are possible and what are the costs for specific projects? A priority list of projects with real costs is needed.

*Question:* What would the impact of shared parking between the Lorig Development and King County have on the area? Will there be enough, including for people coming to the area for the open space?

*Response:* Ron Posthuma indicated that one of the things Lorig was struggling with was the high cost of underground parking. He said that they were looking at parking demand curves and assessing where they had the ability to have visitors and restaurant

goers use the P&R or the parking provided for residents of the development. He said a consideration was that if there were not enough P&R space, people would park on local streets. He said the goal was to look at what was possible but not to “over share.”

The Group was encouraged to send comments about CTIP to Tony Mazzella (tony.mazzella@seattle.gov).

### ***Summary of Issues Related to Consultant Scope of Work for CTIP***

- The NACP should be integrated into the CTIP scope of work, providing a basis for the transportation plan.
- The Stakeholders Group should have the opportunity to review and comment on the assumptions and criteria used in the model..
- With respect to the geographic scope and boundaries for the CTIP, a member asked how far beyond the “core” the study would consider.
- CTIP should focus on multiple ways of moving around Northgate, including pedestrians, bicycles, transit, in addition to automobiles.
- What assumptions will be used in the model with respect to shared parking?
- Ensure that CTIP produces a prioritized list of projects with associated costs.

The Chair encouraged the Group to review the materials SDOT had provided and to bring questions to the June 3 meeting when CTIP would again be on the agenda.

### **Public Comment**

The Chair opened the floor for public comment, calling on individuals who had signed up in advance to speak.

*Comment:* Joel Tufel indicated that he had had many questions about stormwater management that had been sent to the Group and SPU and many had been responded to. He emphasized that for the Group to endorse a plan and stand by it, the Group needed to consider how it would work. He said that over a six-year period he had gone from being a skeptic about the merits of daylighting Thornton Creek to becoming an advocate for it – and now it was no longer being considered. He also felt that the proposed stormwater detention would not work as well as his proposal would and he asked that this issue be discussed at the next meeting.

*Comment:* Phyllis Shulman, staff for City Councilmember Richard Conlin, announced that City Councilmember Richard Conlin and King County Commissioner Bob Ferguson would host a neighborhood issues town meeting on June 8 at Alternative School #1 (formerly known as Pinehurst Elementary School) from 7 pm to 9 pm to listen to public concerns and perspectives. She referred the Group to the flyers in the entryway for additional details.

*Comment:* Gloria Butts thanked everybody in the Group for their tenacity, good thoughts, knowledge and willingness to stick with the process. She said she had attended the May 13<sup>th</sup> forum and thought that it went very well.

*Comment:* Jan Brucker said she echoed some of the comments made earlier in the meeting about the importance of a Planned Action Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). She felt that it was incumbent on the Group to strongly recommend a Planned Action EIS to the Council because it would flesh out the issues and give guidance for the future. With respect to CTIP, she said the map omitted valuable information that had been presented at the Pedestrian Connection Workshop and that walkability issues on the west side of the freeway needed more attention.

*Comment:* Tom Heller strongly suggested that the Stakeholders direct the consults to focus on the connectivity of transit. At the present time, he said, the transit system acts like the old hub and spoke system, forcing transfers to go through the transit center (hub). He said it acts like a wall segregating rather than unifying the four quadrants around it. He encouraged the Group to consider the option of through routes that crossed the area without requiring a transfer at the transit center.

## **Closing**

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:30 pm.

## **Meeting Attendance**

Representatives and Alternates of the **Northgate Stakeholders Group** in attendance were:

**King County Metro:** Rep. Ron Posthuma

**Simon Properties:** Rep. Gary Weber, Alt. Sam Stalin

**Maple Leaf Community Council:** Rep. Janice Camp, Alt. Mel Vannice

**Licton Springs Community Council:**

**Haller Lake Community Council:** Rep. Velva Maye, Sue Geving

**Pinehurst Community Council:** Rep. Lorna Mrachek

**Victory Heights Community Council:** Rep. Brad Cummings

**Northgate Chamber of Commerce:** Rep. Shaiza Damji, Alt. Scott Greer

**Thornton Creek Alliance:** Rep. John Lombard

**Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund:** Rep. Janet Way, Alt. Bob Vreeland

**North Seattle Community College:** Rep. Ronald H. LaFayette, Alt. Bruce Kieser

**Northwest Hospital:** Alt. Rose Dammrose

**Owners of Three or More Acres:** Rep. Kevin Wallace

**Senior Housing:** Rep. Jeanne Hayden, Alt. Sandra Morgan

**Renters/Condominium Owners:** Rep. Debra Fulton, Alt. Brad Mason

**Multi-family Housing Developers:** Alt. Tom Donnelly

**Businesses Inside the Mall:** Rep. Kurt Schauermann

**Businesses Outside the Mall:** Rep. Michelle Rupp

DPD – Northgate Stakeholders Group

June 3, 2004 Meeting Summary Handout

*May 20, 2004 Meeting Summary*

**Youth:** Rep. Diana Medina, Alt. Alexia Dorsch

**Labor:** Rep. Brad Larrsen

**At-large:** Rep. Shawn Olesen, Alt. Barbara Maxwell

**At-large:** Rep. Marilyn Firlotte, Alt. Mike Vincent

Members of the Triangle Associates facilitation team included: Alice Shorett, David Harrison, Vicki King, and Darcie Garland-Renn.